

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the references cited in Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement of March 31, 2005 have been considered.

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 9-12, 15-17, 19-24 and 28 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §101

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 28 has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claim is directed to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101 and request that this rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 98/42173 to Lahti et al. (hereinafter "Lahti"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Lahti is directed to a method to perform banking services using a digital cellular radio system to transfer SMS type messages between a bank and a user of the digital cellular radio system. (See, for example, the Abstract, Fig. 1 and Pgs. 2 and 3 of Lahti) Lahti further describes that a first SMS message is sent from the cell user to a user interface server 16 of the bank's computer equipment 15, where data included in the first SMS message from the cell user

causes a first banking service to be carried out by the bank's computer equipment 15. (See, Fig. 1 and Pg. 2 of Lahti) The bank's computer equipment 15 sends a reply SMS message to the cell user which message represents the result of the first banking service performed for the cell user by the bank's computer equipment 15. (Id.)

Lahti does not disclose sending a list of available templates for a SMS message to a cell user. Lahti describes that a bank or other party to a payment traffic initiates a procedure by simply sending a short message to which a user can respond by sending a reply message, but the short message of Lahti to the user is not described in Lahti as including a list of available templates from which list a user recipient may select an available template. (See, page 3, lines 9-13 of Lahti) Additionally, Lahti does not disclose receiving from the cell user a selection of at least one of the available templates, but instead the bank or other sending party of Lahti simply receives a short message reply from the user without any description in Lahti of the user having selected a template from a list of available templates sent by the bank or other sending party which list is included in the message sent by the bank or other sending party. (Id.)

Furthermore, Lahti does not disclose generating at least one encoded and categorized SMS business message in response to receiving from the cell user the selection of at least one of the available templates. As described above, in Lahti a bank or other party sends a short message to a user, but the message does not include a list of available templates for the user to select. Additionally, in Lahti the bank's computer equipment 15 sends a response message to a user in response to a banking request by a user (e.g., balance inquiry request), but the response message from the bank's computer equipment 15 is in response to the request of the user and is not in response to and corresponding to a selection of an available template from a list of available templates received by the user from the bank. (See, page 6, line 29 – page 7, line 4; and Fig. 1 of Lahti)

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Lahti does not disclose a method for generating an SMS business message including:

“sending a list of a plurality of available inbound templates for a SMS business message to a mobile recipient;

receiving from the mobile recipient a selection of at least one of the available inbound templates from the list;

generating at least one encoded categorized SMS business message in response to and corresponding to the selection received from the mobile recipient such that the generated at

least one encoded categorized SMS business message includes a corresponding inbound template;

sending the generated at least one encoded categorized SMS business message to the mobile recipient; and

receiving at least one request sent from the mobile recipient in response to the sending of the at least one encoded categorized SMS business message to perform a business transaction in a data processing system,” as currently recited in claim 1.

Thus, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 21

Independent claim 21 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. For at least the reasons given above in regard to amended independent claim 1, Lahti does not disclose a system to generate a SMS business message including

“a server which includes:

a data collection interface to accept outgoing instructions and outgoing data for the mobile recipient in response to the mobile recipient having selected at least one of a plurality of SMS inbound templates from a list sent to the mobile recipient by the system;

a message encoding engine to generate an encoded SMS business message from information provided by the data collection interface, and corresponding to the selection by the mobile recipient of the at least one SMS inbound template, using an encoding template such that the SMS business message is a categorized SMS message formatted for processing by a data processing system; and

a dispatcher runtime processor to process said encoded SMS business message for transmission over a network to the mobile recipient,” as currently recited in claim 21.

(Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 21 is patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 22

Independent claim 22 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. For at least the reasons given above in regard to amended independent claim 1, Lahti does not disclose a computer program product which includes a method including:

“sending a list of a plurality of available inbound templates for a SMS business message to a mobile recipient;

receiving from the mobile recipient a selection of at least one of the available inbound templates from the list;

generating at least one encoded categorized SMS business message in response to and corresponding to the selection received from the mobile recipient such that the generated at least one encoded categorized SMS business message includes a corresponding inbound template;

sending the generated at least one encoded categorized SMS business message to the mobile recipient; and

receiving at least one request sent from the mobile recipient in response to the sending of the at least one encoded categorized SMS business message to perform a business transaction in a data processing system,” as currently recited in claim 22.

Thus, independent claim 22 is patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23

Independent claim 23 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Lahti is described above in regard to independent claim 1. As described therein, Lahti describes a method to perform a business transaction via a SMS message sent from a cell user to a bank's computer equipment 15, and the computer equipment 15 then responds with a SMS response message indicating the completed business transaction.

In contrast, the invention of independent claim 23 is directed to a method for processing an incoming e-commerce SMS response message received by a server from a mobile recipient responding to an outgoing e-commerce SMS message. In other words, the response SMS message of claim 23 is from a mobile user in response to the SMS message from the bank, and not a response SMS message from a bank's computer equipment in response to a SMS

message from a cell user, as described in Lahti.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Lahti that an inbound message template is identified and obtained from a database, and used to parse a SMS response message from the mobile user.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Lahti does not disclose a method for processing an incoming e-commerce SMS response message received by a server from a mobile recipient responding to an outgoing e-commerce SMS message, including:

“receiving said SMS response message;
identifying and obtaining from a database a corresponding inbound message template for said response message from said server; and
parsing said SMS response message with said inbound message template to extract data and instructions contained in said response message, if any, for processing said data and instructions,” as currently recited in claim 23. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 24

Independent claim 24 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Lahti is described above in regard to independent claim 1. Additionally, the Examiner has on page 12 of the Office Action stated that Lahti allegedly describes on Pg. 2, ln. 12 the equivalent of the “message text entry field” of claim 24. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lahti describes on Pg. 2, ln. 12 that a first banking service is carried out based on data contained in the first SMS message sent from the cell user. Thus, in Lahti, a banking service is simply performed by the bank’s computer equipment 15 in response to the first SMS message sent from the cell user. This is not the equivalent of a “message text field for alerting a mobile recipient about a commerce event identified in the message text field,” as currently recited in claim 24, which is sent over a network to a mobile recipient to alert the mobile recipient. In Lahti, no alert is given to the cell user about a commerce event. In fact, in Lahti, when the SMS message is received by the bank’s computer equipment 15, the cell user does not know that a commerce event has occurred.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Lahti does not disclose an SMS commerce

message format for use in sending a commerce message over a network to a mobile recipient, including:

“a message text entry field for alerting a mobile recipient about a commerce event identified in the message text entry field,” as currently recited in claim 24, where the SMS message is sent to the mobile recipient. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 24 is patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 28

Independent claim 28 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Lahti is described above in regard to independent claim 1. As described therein, Lahti describes a method to perform a business transaction via a SMS message sent from a cell user to a bank's computer equipment 15, and the computer equipment 15 then responds with a SMS response message indicating the completed business transaction. There is no description in Lahti of, among other things, that categorization meta data provides definitions of messages and instructions that are parsable into runtime objects used by a data processing system to generate SMS business messages.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Lahti does not disclose a computer program product which includes “categorization meta data defining a commerce categorization of outbound SMS messages such that said commerce categorization of outbound SMS messages represents a specific intended business usage of the outbound SMS message, wherein said categorization meta data provides definitions of messages and instructions that are parsable into runtime objects used by said data processing system to generate SMS business messages,” as currently recited in claim 28. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 28 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-20 and 25-27

Regarding dependent claims 2-20 and 25-27, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 1 or 24, they include all of the features of the independent claim from which

Serial No.: 10/529,988
Docket No.: CA920020072US1
Reply to the Office Action of July 3, 2008

they respectively depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding independent claims 1 and 24, Lahti does not disclose all the features of these dependent claims. Therefore, claims 2-20 and 25-27 are patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 2-20 and 25-27 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to **IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: Sept. 30, 2008
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759
Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: Joseph W. King
Joseph W. King
Registration No. 35, 768